

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-7, 9, 11-13, 15 and 17-22 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, 1-3, 5, 6 and 18-22 are amended. No new matter is added. In view of at least the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Boddie at the interview held May 2, 2008, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below, which constitute Applicant's separate record of the interview.

Claims 1, 3-7, 12, 18 and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,892,493 (Enami) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,079,130 (130 LeChevalier) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,050,024 (024 LeChevalier); claims 2 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Enami in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,113,134 (Plus) and further in view of 024 LeChevalier; claims 9, 13, 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Enami in view of 130 LeChevalier and 024 LeChevalier and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,861,810 (Rutherford); and claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Enami in view of Plus and 024 LeChevalier and further in view of Rutherford. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The applied references fail to disclose or suggest an electro-optical device including shared lines where "each of the test lines being shared with a corresponding precharge supply line to form a shared line that extends at least from a connection with the at least one data line at the first and second switches along one line toward a precharge signal-generating circuit and an output of the detection signal," as recited in independent claim 1.

The Office Action cites 024 LeChevalier as allegedly disclosing the shared lines defined the claims. See Office Action at page 6. The Office Action asserts that element 274

in Fig. 8 of 024 LeChevalier is electrically connected to current control circuit 294 (alleged pre-charge circuit) and the testing circuitry illustrated on the right-hand side of Fig. 8. Thus, the Office Action asserts that it would have been obvious to wire the circuitry of 130 LeChevalier and Enami as taught by 024 LeChevalier.

As discussed during the interview, even if the interpretation of 024 LeChevalier advanced in the Office Action is accepted, the alleged shared line 274 does not extend from a data line connection at first and second switches along one line toward a precharge signal-generating circuit and an output of the detection signal. As required in claim 1, the first switches control a supply of a precharge signal from a precharge supply line to a data line, the second switches control the output of a detection signal from the data line to test lines, and the test lines are shared with precharge supply lines at least from a connection with the data line at the first and second switches. Referring to Fig. 8 of 024 LeChevalier, the alleged shared line 274 does not extend from a connection with the data line at first and second switches.

As also discussed during the interview, in 024 LeChevalier, the alleged shared line 274 extends from the connection with the data line in one direction toward circuit 294 and in another direction toward the alleged test circuit (right-hand circuitry). That is, even if 024 LeChevalier is interpreted as disclosing that line 274, circuit 294 and testing circuitry are part of the same electrical node, the alleged shared line 274 branches toward each circuit after the connection point with the data line. More specifically, as agreed in the interview, the alleged shared line 274 branches into two separate electrical lines from its connection with the data line, rather than extending along one line toward a precharge signal-generating circuit and an output of the detection signal, as required in claim 1.

Accordingly, for each of the above reasons, independent claim 1 is patentable over the applied references.

Independent claims 2, 3, 5 and 6 recite similar features referred to above in connection with claim 1 and are therefore also patentable over the applied references for at least the reasons enumerated above, as well as for the additional features they recite.

Claims 4 and 7-22 depend from one of independent claims 1-3, 5 and 6 and are therefore also patentable over the applied references for at least the reasons enumerated above, as well as for the additional features they recite.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Aaron L. Webb  
Registration No. 56,930

JAO:ALW/ldg

Date: May 19, 2008

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------